CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD REGULAR MEETING JANUARY 11, 2021

The City of Lake Wales Code Enforcement Board held a hybrid virtual and in person meeting on January 11th, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Chamber located in the City Administration Building.

ATTENDANCE

Code Enforcement Board Members

(Shaded area indicates absence):

Albert (Chuck) Galloway, Jr. – City Attorney Appeared Remotely - Virtually

City Staff: Development Services Department

Jose Lozada- Code Compliance Officer (Appeared Remotely)

Fany Lozano - Recording Secretary

Christina Adams – Administrative Assistant

Cheryl Baksh – Administrative Assistant

Mark J. Bennett - Development Services Director

City Staff: Information Technology Department

Kevin Sunderland – IT Manager

Daniel Gonzalez-IT Technician II

Johnny Ramirez - IT Technician I

- 1) CALL TO ORDER Meeting called to order at 5:30 pm
- 2) ROLL CALL A quorum was present. All members present attended in person.
- 3) COVID STATEMENT/HYBRID MEETINGS Fany Lozano

Mr. Marino stated for the record that there was no virtual statement to be made as the order for virtual meeting was not extended.

Ms. Lozano stated for the record:

Staff would like for the Board Members to know that although some businesses have been affected by the Pandemic, The Development Services department which houses the Building and Permitting Division, The Planning and Zoning Division and the Code Compliance Division has remained open, and they have continued to accept permits via email and on an appointment basis even while the building continues to be closed to the public. Also, the recording office in Bartow has been accepting items for recording via regular mail. Business for the Development Services Department has not been interrupted.

Some members of staff are appearing virtually today. City Attorney Mr. Galloway and Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada are in attendance virtually.

4) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Regular Meeting – November 9th, 2020

Ms. Jones made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections. Mr. Vreeland seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

5) ADMINISTER OATH/MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

5.1 Administer Oath:

Board secretary administered the oath to staff and respondents.

5.2 Memo – Reduction Guidelines – Fany Lozano

Ms. Lozano did not go over the memo. The memo will be discussed at the communications and petitions portion of the agenda.

6) CASE(s) New Business

6.1 Case # 2019-00651

City of Lake Wales VS H La Faye Sayles

705 Greenleaf Lane

PID: 27-29-35-880010-000510

Violation(s): Multiple Violations

Property Owner/Respondent was not present to provide testimony.

Code Compliance Officer read the case information into the record, and notified the Board Members that this case has come into compliance as of 01/11/2021 and requested that the case be dismissed. Ms. Paul made a motion to dismiss the case. Ms. Jones seconded the motion. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

6.2 Case # 2020-00353

City of Lake Wales VS Stephanie Tookes

334 C Street

PID: 27-29-35-879000-005011

Violation(s): 12-233.4 Weeds, Grass and Overgrowth

12-233.1 Sanitation and Storage of Materials

Property Owner/Respondent was not present to provide testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented the case and its history. He stated that this is a high grass and weeds case and there is also junk and trash on the premises. He stated that this property is in constant violation with other violations to include vehicles and structure issues. He stated that:

STAFF REQUESTS THE BOARD:

- 1) Find that all cited violations were allowed to exist past the date for correction and
- 2) Find that Proper Notice has been afforded to the Property Owner and,
- 3) Find that all Procedural requirements have been met.

AND STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD:

1) Impose a fine in the amount of \$250 (per day), every day the violation exists effective immediately Or Board's Discretion.

Ms. Jones asked if there has been any contact with the property owner. Mr. Lozada responded that he has not had contact but that they did call in for a compliance inspection and that they did attempt to do something but the violations were not completely addressed. Mr. Marino stated that the grass on the right of way looks really bad. Mr. Lozada stated that all property owners are responsible for the abutting right of way. Ms. Jones asked that if as part of staff recommendation does it involve the property also being maintained. Mr. Lozada responded no and that we are only recommending daily fines until the property owner brings the premises into compliance and that future abatement is an option. Ms. Jones stated that she is concerned that property owner may not be aware of hearing and the possibility of fines. Mr. Lozada stated that either way there will be a cost associated with abatement or fines. Ms. Vreeland stated that the property owner is aware that they should maintain the premises. There was open discussion about the daily fines and or the cost of possibly abating the violations. Ms. Vreeland asked if it is the entire parcel. Mr. Lozada explained that violations exist at the entire premises and that there are multiple structures on this lot, but that it is all one parcel. Ms. Vreeland expressed concern and she stated this is a lot or too much to get done. Mr. Marino was concerned that the property owner was not in attendance. Ms. Lozano asked to be sworn in, and Mr. Marino swore Ms. Lozano in so that she can provide testimony. Ms. Lozano stated that the respondent did call her and is aware of the violations, and that Ms. Lozano explained to her what needed to be done. Ms. Jones asked Ms. Lozano if the premises is abated does the charge go to the property taxes. Ms. Lozano explained that the property owner would be invoiced for the services and if they do not pay the invoice, then a lien will be placed for the invoice and then the invoice amount due will be forwarded to the property taxes. Ms. Jones asked what happens if we fine the property and they

still do not comply. Ms. Lozano stated that the fines will accrue and at some point the City can pursue foreclosure on the lien. Ms. Jones stated that her concern is that the property owner may not be aware of the fines since they are not here. Ms. Lozano explained that there is verbiage on the notices that talks about the possibility of fines being assessed. Mr. Wilson asked if this owner is out of town? Ms. Lozano looked up the notice and confirmed that the property owner is out of town. Ms. Vreeland stated that the notice is posted right by the mailbox and Mr. Marino affirmed that the posted notice is there on the right of way. Mr. Galloway stated that the posted notice is sufficient and that after the fines begin to accrue the Code Enforcement Board can authorize foreclosure after 90 days of accrual. Ms. Paul made a motion that we apply abatement against this property in order to achieve compliance with the improvements that are necessary. Ms. Jones seconded the motion. Ms. Lozano restated the motion that abatement will be applied and costs will be passed on to the property owner. All voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Lozano stated: Let the record show that Mr. Wilson is now in attendance.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Galloway if she needed to recuse herself from the next case. On behalf of the Lincoln Community Development Incorporation Ms. Jones contacted the property owner in reference to the below mentioned property to see if it would be something suitable for the CDC. Ms. Jones stated it was not personal or for any personal benefit but that she wants it to be on the record in case she needs to recuse herself. Mr. Galloway stated that Ms. Jones does not have a problem because she does not have a personal pecuniary interest in the property.

6.3 Case # 2020-00432

City of Lake Wales VS Lincoln Ave Land Trust # 301 c/o Amir Kalde 224 Lincoln Ave W

PID: 27-29-35-880000-008060

Violation(s): 12-230.05 Dangerous Structure on Premises.

Amir Kalde, Property Owner/Respondent was present to provide testimony. Ms. Lozano administered the Oath to all persons above who provided testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented the case and its history. He stated that the violation for this case is a dangerous unsafe structure. He also stated that the premises has been deemed unsafe and uninhabitable by the Building Official. He stated that:

STAFF REQUESTS THE BOARD:

- 1) Find that all cited violations were allowed to exist past the date for correction and
- 2) Find that Proper Notice has been afforded to the Property Owner and,
- 3) Find that all Procedural requirements have been met.

*AND STAFF RECOMMENDS THE BOARD:

- 1) Impose a fine in the amount of \$250 (per day), every day the violation exists effective immediately
- 2) Authorize the Code Compliance Division to start the demolition process. Or Board's Discretion

Mr. Kalde provided testimony for the Board and stated that he is an investor and has not been able to move forward with some of his projects. He stated that he is motivated to do more things after meeting the Building Official Bill Nolen and Mr. Bennett, Director of Development Services. He stated that he wants to work with The CRA to move forward. He stated that he feels like he is being personally attacked by a man named Kevin Black who is interested in purchasing this property and is possibly putting pressure on him to reduce the sale price. He stated that Mr. Black implied that he knows people on the Board. He stated that he does not have respect for Code Compliance Officer Lozada. He stated that he had no intention on being at this hearing today until Ms. Lozano convinced him to appear because his case is on the agenda. He stated that his intention is to work with the CRA but has not heard back from the CRA office as he has tried to make numerous appointments that have been cancelled. He stated that he feels that we all need to work together and that he is trying to stay calm but he feels attacked. He is asking the Board for 60 days so that he can meet with the CRA office, and an engineer so that they can determine what is the best thing for the property or he can do his business elsewhere.

Mr. Marino asked why is the building unsafe? Mr. Lozada responded that the building has no roof, it is a delapitated structure and it is actively falling apart. Ms. Vreeland asked Mr. Kalde if he has seen or walked the premises before. Mr. Kalde responded that he has had challenges because Mr. Lozada is a crook. Ms. Vreeland asked Mr. Kalde how he knows Ms. Jones. He responded because she contacted him about purchasing the property before. Ms. Jones stated that this is what she mentioned early in regards to recusing herself. Mr. Kalde began to make negative comments about staff and Ms. Jones told him that we need to stay away from inter personal issues and get to the root of the problem. Ms. Jones asked if this building can be secured in a way that makes it safe? Mr. Wilson stated that the issue is it has no roof. Mr. Marino asked Mr. Kalde what is his plan with the property after the 60 days pass? Mr. Kalde responded that he would like to work with Ms. Jones and the CRA. Ms. Jones asked Mr. Bennet what his knowledge with the CRA situation is? Mr. Bennett asked to be sworn in. Ms. Lozano swore Mr. Bennett in for the record. Mr. Bennett responded that CRA is in the process of trying to initiate programs, activities and proposals to acquire properties but that there is no specific program at this time. Mr. Marino stated that if the premises is secured he would be willing to grant the 60 days. Mr. Bennett advised the Board that on the projector they can see the Notice of Unsafe structure which mentions what the issues are what can be done to make the corrections. Ms. Vreeland stated that this is the exact same thing as the Estes building, Mr. Lozada also notified the Board that the building is open and unsecured and that when he posted the notice on the building he was the one that placed a cinder block on the door to somehow secure the structure. Ms. Jones stated that she has personally moved the block and has been inside the building and that she does not think the block came from the building. Ms. Vreeland expressed concern that people can go inside the building. Ms. Jones stated that if the building can be made safe she does not see a problem with an additional 60 days and for the case to be brought back for further action. Ms. Lozano stated that the Board can accept staff recommendation with an extended deadline.

Ms. Jones made a motion accept staff recommendation but amended it to allow 60 days for the fine to start to accrue. Ms. Paul seconded the motion Mr. Kalde made a statement and Mr. Marino stated that there is a motion on the floor and he is out of order. Mr. Marino called for a vote and there was no response. Ms. Jones stated that she can not vote knowing that Mr. Kalde has something else to say. Mr. Marino stated that the motion has failed. Mr. Kalde stated that he does not understand as he was not notified. Ms. Jones stated that we are doing what he asked for

although it sounded like we did not. Ms. Jones went on to explain her motion to Mr. Kalde which gives him the time that he has requested so that he can do what he needs to do. Ms. Jones stated that the building has been in this condition for a very long time. Mr. Kalde stated that he is being singled out. Mr. Kalde stated that he is willing to secure the structure but that this issue only came to light because of Mr. Black. Ms. Jones stated that the Building Division has said that the building is unsafe. Mr. Kalde stated that he will look into demolishing the structure himself. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Kalde what is his intention and then went on to say that it has been 8 years that he has owned the building and that he cannot vote until he hears what Mr. Kalde will do with the building. Mr. Kalde stated that the timing of this case rubbed him the wrong way. Mr. Austell asked Mr. Kalde, have you done a thorough walk through and that Mr. Lozada is doing his job. Mr. Kalde stated that he went into the building 6 months ago but that he never stepped inside.

Ms. Jones made a motion that the grass must be cut within 7 days, that the building be secured within 7 days, that 60 days be granted to come into compliance, failure to comply will result in \$250 daily fine, and that 90 days after the 60 days the City of Lake Wales is authorized to start the demolition process. Ms. Paul seconded the motion. Nays were heard at voting and roll call vote is as follows:

1st Jones - Yes

2nd Paul – Yes

Austell - Yes

Wilson - Yes

Vreeland - No

Marino - Yes

The motion passed with 5 yays and 1 nay.

6.4 Case # 2006-00002

City of Lake Wales VS Cohasset Ave Land Trust # 1069 c/o Amir Kalde

1069 Cohassett Ave

PID: 27-30-12-923000-002250

Violation(s): N/A Request for Reduction

Amir Kalde, Property Owner/Respondent was present to provide testimony. Ms. Lozano administered the Oath to all persons above who provided testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented this case and its history. He stated that this is request for reduction of the administrative liens in the amount of \$883,250. He stated that staff cannot make a recommendation for reduction because the premises were inspected today and the premises is in violation. There is currently high grass and weeds and junk and trash on the premises. Consideration of the reduction is at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Kalde stated that there is a demolition lien associated with this parcel and that he has met with Building Official William Nolen and that his intention is to sell it and build a house on the lot. He stated that he is asking for a waiver of the liens and that he should have blueprints by February 15th, and that there is a deadline of March 1st for impact fees. Mr. Kalde asked for fees to be waived subject to a permit for a house being issued and subject to grass being cut. Mr. Bennet stated that according to city ordinance impact fees are waived if a new home is built within 5 years from removal of structures on a lot and that there appears to be a sense of urgency because of this. Ms. Jones stated that the grass needs to be cut and that, that usually goes beyond just mowing. Mr. Kalde stated that he is willing to walk away from the premises if he does not

get relief. Ms. Vreeland asked Mr. Kalde how many properties does he own within the City of Lake Wales, Mr. Kalde responded that he owns hundreds of properties. Ms. Vreeland asked if he has hired a maintenance crew. Mr. Kalde stated that when he feels lack of cooperation and lack of communication he moves elsewhere. Mr. Kalde mentioned that he wants to obtain permits and that the liens are affecting him obtaining a permit. Ms. Jones asked at what point did this premises become non-compliant. Mr. Lozada responded that it came to his attention when Mr. Kalde made the request for reduction of the lien and that he did an inspection to make sure that the premises was in compliance, and that at the time of inspection he observed that the premises was not in compliance, and Mr. Kalde was notified that the premises was not in compliance because the grass is high, and that Mr. Kalde stated that he would take care of the violations. Ms. Jones asked when was Mr. Kalde notified. Ms Lozano responded on December 23, 2020. Ms. Jones asked Mr. Kalde if there is a reason why it was not brought in compliance from December 23 till now? Mr. Kalde responded that he was under the impression that the liens were already being reversed and that he contacted Ms. Lozano and she explained the process. Ms. Lozano stated that this is not a permit related issue and that this is a regular request for reduction made by the property owner. Mr. Wilson asked if there had been a structure on the lot? Ms. Lozano responded that there has been. Mr. Wilson stated, so we are trying to forgive county liens? Ms. Lozano responded no because the demolition lien that Mr. Kalde is speaking of is a lien that the county placed on the premises because the county demolished the structure, our fines are for the violations of the substandard structure/garage which stopped running when the County demolished the structures. Ms. Jones asked Mr. Bennett what are his thoughts on this? Mr. Bennett stated that the ultimate goal is compliance and the fact is that the premises is not completely in compliance. Mr. Kalde stated that he is asking for fees to be waived subject to the premises being cleaned up by Monday and subject to permitting. Ms. Lozano stated that permitting is not the issue, the issue is cutting the grass, removing the junk and trash and any dead trees that are the premises. Ms. Jones made a motion to waive the fines to zero after premises have been moved within 7 days. Mr. Wilson stated that what he is hearing from Mr. Kalde is that if certain things do not happen, then he will also do nothing. Mr. Wilson stated that it is the responsibility of the property owner to maintain the premises in compliance all the time. Mr. Wilson stated that staff makes recommendations and we go away from them every time. Ms. Vreeland stated: "We Have no Teeth." There was open discussion about comments that are made about the Board not having teeth and that the Board is too soft and too lenient. Ms. Paul seconded the motion. There were nays heard at voting and a roll call vote was requested.

Roll call vote is as follows:

1st Jones - Yes

2nd Paul – Yes

Austell - Yes

Wilson – No

Vreeland - No

Marino - Yes

The motion passed with 4 yays and 2 nays.

Mr. Bennet stated that if compliance is not achieved the fine should revert back to the original amount. Everyone agreed.

6.5 Case # 2014-00006

City of Lake Wales VS Cohasset Ave Land Trust # 1069 c/o Amir Kalde 1069 Cohassett Ave

PID: 27-30-12-923000-002250

Violation(s): N/A Request for Reduction

Amir Kalde, Property Owner/Respondent was present to provide testimony. Ms. Lozano administered the Oath to all persons above who provided testimony.

Code Compliance Officer Jose Lozada presented this case and its history. He stated that this is request for reduction of the administrative liens in the amount of \$183,250.00. He stated that staff cannot make a recommendation for reduction because the premises were inspected today and the premises is in violation. There is currently high grass and weeds and junk and trash on the premises. Consideration of the reduction is at the Board's discretion.

There was not a lot of discussion on this case as it was the same address and same property owner of item number 6.4. Testimony and summary of item 6.4 is being considered for this case.

Ms. Jones made a motion to waive the fines to zero after premises have been mowed within 7 days. Failure to comply will revert the reduction to its original amount of if no reduction was ever granted. Ms. Paul seconded the motion. There were nays heard at voting and a roll call vote was requested.

Roll call vote is as follows:

1st Jones – Yes

2nd Paul – Yes

Austell - Yes

Wilson - No

Vreeland - No

Marino - Yes

The motion passed with 4 yays and 2 nays.

Mr. Marino expressed his aggravation and stated that the property owner is before us because his back is against the wall. He stated that salaries have to be paid to do the job and we have to get the money in another way than the tax roll. Ms. Jones, stated that the reason why she made the motion that she made was because all of these fines were incurred when Mr. Kalde was not the property owner, however all of the properties that came before the Board tonight were out of compliance. She stated that as long as she sits on the Board she will always accept something that comes before her so long as the properties are in compliance. She stated that Mr. Kalde should retain someone to maintain his properties. She stated that if Mr. Kalde comes before the Board again she expects for his properties to be mowed.

7) COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS/OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Marino opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Marino asked Ms. Baksh if there was anyone online who wanted to make any comments. Ms. Baksh responded there is no one online that wanted to make any comments.

Mr. Marino asked Ms. Adams if there was anyone outside who wanted to make any

comments. Ms. Adams responded there is no one outside that wanted to make any comments.

Ms. Lozano proceeded with discussing the Memo – Guidelines for Reductions. Ms. Lozano stated that she emailed all of the Board members a memo and asked if there were any questions in regards to the memo. Ms. Jones asked if there is a way that staff that can provide to the Board an estimate of time spent. She stated that she thinks that would help with having an idea as to what to reduce liens to instead of reducing down to zero. Ms. Lozano stated that she can look into and work on something and get back to the Board, but the memo is just to give the Board members an idea and a baseline as to what they can try to move to. Mr. Wilson stated that is the reason why he voted No, because the fines get reduced to zero but the City has incurred some financial costs. Mr. Wilson stated that when these investors go over to the County is it a whole different process and sometimes they don't forgive the fines, and that even if we reduce our fines there is no guarantee that the property will end up with a structure. He stated that he agrees with Sarah about having a better figure and a better understanding of actual time spent as Jose's job is a hard job. Ms. Vreeland stated that she feels that he should have paid something because these investors are just buying properties and just leaving them and not taking care of them and they don't care if the property is not in compliance. Ms. Vreeland stated that this is reason why the Board gets accused of not having any teeth and that she has heard it all the time. Ms. Jones stated that she would be interested in seeing what is the average amount of time spent at each level of the chart provided in the memo. Mr. Wilson stated that like the property on Lincoln Ave, someone notified and reported the complaint and it could be a 10 minute phone call or it could be an hour for Jose to go out there and the Board can come up with some numbers and work with them themselves. He stated that he just wants to make sure that Citizens and our investors are all in the same page. Mr. Wilson stated how much time do we give people because that property owner (Amir Kalde) has owned that property for 8 years. Ms. Lozano stated that going back to Ms. Jones question of actual time spent, she stated that it varies because there may be a case where only a week was spent but the property owner complied, then you have a case like ones we heard today for the reduction, that one case was three or four inspections on the property, so we have spent time on that case, Jose's time, her time, the vehicles, phone calls, emails back and forth, the contractor communication, it varies, and it will never be the same. Mr. Bennett stated that what he envisions is a base fee and then as we get more familiar with how much time we spent on a call. Ms. Jones suggested that on the sheet that they receive, a dollar amount can be added. Ms. Lozano stated that in the County they call their fee a cost of prosecution and no matter what that is an automatic fee. Mr. Marino invited Mr. Goldstein to speak. Mr. Goldstein stated that this was an exciting night for him because the Board Members argued the case that he has been talking about with Mr. Bennett and Mr. Slaton in the last month or so. He stated that he agreed when it was said, "You have no teeth". He stated that he agrees with Mr. Wilson when he said we should of kept some fine. He stated that anyone's fine who comes to the Board only when their back is against the wall but what they don't realize is that they put the City's back against the wall and it just doesn't work and a percentage should be kept to cover the cost. Mr. Goldstein invited the Board member's to attend the Commission Workshop on Wednesday at 3pm in the City Commission Chambers. He stated that he feels great that the Board had this conversation tonight and thanked the Board. Mr. Bennett stated that the 5% standard that we are suggesting, and that it represents a really high number but maybe there should be some consideration for a tiered amount but that of course the Board can always reduce the fine to any other amount. He stated that as a Citizen he writes a check to his lawn care company every month, and he is out there maintaining his property too, if he can do it others can

do it. Ms. Vreeland stated that, that is what she was suggesting and that you should not blame it on the COVID19. Mr. Wilson stated that genuine investors have different interests, some want to flip properties and some are committed and they will take a different avenue than an outside investor. He stated that they care and that is why they are volunteering their time and that the City cannot just go and abate property just because you don't get along with a said staff member, and that is what irritated him with Mr. Kalde. He thanked Jose and Fany and Brian in the past and he just wants to make sure that every person that comes before the podium to know that they have had every opportunity to find out. He also stated that the spirited conversation was healthy and it is keeping them in the right track. Ms. Vreeland stated that guideline number three which states how the property was obtained is very, very important information to be able to know who they are dealing with. Ms. Lozano stated that in regards to the 5% recommendation, it might seem outrageous to the Board when they see those recommendations, those numbers may not be very realistic numbers because we may never collect, but keep in mind that the Board still has the authority to reduce that number down, but that as a staring base staff will continue to recommend the 5% and then possibly she will look into some sort of tiered system and that any Board member suggestions are welcomed. Mr. Wilson asked Mr. Galloway if it would be out of line to ask Mr. Lozada what he thinks the amount of dollars estimated on a case should be. Mr. Galloway responded that no, it would not be inappropriate. Ms. Jones stated that if there is a way to actually track it, it would be good to put it in use. Mr. Wilson stated that he agrees but maybe the Officer gets distracted and forgets to log it. Ms. Lozano stated that she has done some research and that the general number that other municipalities tend to stick to is a minimum of \$1,000 and about a max of \$5,000. Ms. Jones suggested \$1,000 for every \$50,000. Ms. Lozano stated she will work with the suggestion and see what she can come up with. Ms. Jones would love to see more systematic guidelines. Discussion on the memo ended. Ms. Lozano put the rest of her comments on hold as there was a member in the audience that entered the Chambers as the memo discussion was taking place.

Henry Kabahjian, property owner of the Seminole Hotel addressed the Board. He stated that he purchased the hotel and a lot of burden has been put on his shoulders with the foreclosure action against the property. He stated that he has been an investor in the City of Lake Wales for the last few years. He stated that he owned Georgios and he had to sell the property. He stated that he was told that no one can do anything about the foreclosure action except the Code Enforcement Board. He stated that he found out this Board has the power to recall the foreclosure action. He stated that he hired and attorney but he does not want to spend \$15,000 to \$25,000. He is hoping that he can get put on the agenda so that the Board can see the floor plans that he has made for the hotel. He stated that he notified the City as soon as he purchased it and thought the City would be happy, but 5 days later he was hit with the foreclosure action. Ms. Jones stated that the Board cannot make the decision, nor does the Board have the authority to add him to the agenda. Mr. Kabahjian stated that no one is directing him in the right direction. Ms. Jones stated that our City Attorney is here. Mr. Galloway stated that the Board does not have any jurisdiction over the Seminole Hotel at this point because the Board authorized the foreclosure action, the foreclosure action continues. Mr. Galloway stated that he received notice from Mr. Kabahjian's attorney and he intends to speak with said attorney tomorrow, but there is nothing where this body has any jurisdiction now. Mr. Kabahjian asked if there can be a stay while there are improvements. Ms. Jones stated that it is not about improvements at this point and that Mr. Kabahjian's attorney has to speak to Mr. Galloway to deal with the foreclosure process.

Ms. Vreeland asked if they had voted for demolition. Ms. Lozano stated that yes they did, but the demolition bid came in at \$700,000 because of the asbestos and the City does not have the funds to demolish the structure at that amount and that is why the case was brought to the Board for foreclosure which they approved.

Ms. Lozano notified the Board that there is a new Board Member procedure. Going forward whenever someone applies to be on the Board, the applicant has to appear before the Board and the Board has to make a recommendation on the record. Once the recommendation is made even if it is not a positive recommendation, the applicant will then appear before the City Commission and the City Commission will appoint with the Board's recommendation even if it is a negative recommendation. Ms. Lozano reminded Ms. Vreeland that she has to take a break for a year. Ms. Lozano reminded Ms. Jones and Mr. Wilson that their terms expire this year in July and that if they want to continue to serve, they should submit their applications early because they would have to come before the Code Enforcement Board, and we would like to plan ahead so that the seats are filled in July when re-appointment takes place, and they have enough time to appear before the City Commission. Ms. Vreeland asked if she has to go through this process. Ms. Lozano responded yes.

Ms. Lozano reminded the Board of Mr. Goldstein's invitation to attend the workshop. One of the items for discussion on the workshop agenda is Magistrate Discussion. She notified the Board that they can appear in person or virtually by registering online. She stated that she will email all of the Board Member's the link to register. The workshop will be held on Wednesday 1/13/2021 at 3pm in the City Commission Chambers.

Mr. Bennett thanked the Board for their time and said this job is very important and that he appreciated the discussions tonight.

Mr. Marino reminded everyone on the Board that there is a stickling point with him about signs all over the City. He stated Mr. Lozada is by himself now and Ms. Lozano has to go out and help him at times. We have the right to remove those signs when people place them on the public right of way and if you don't want to put them in your garbage, you can drive up to Mr. Lozada's truck and place them in the back of his Code Compliance Truck.

8) ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was then adjourned at 7:34pm.

Ralph Marino, Chairperson or

alsh Mario

Wilena Vreeland, Vice Chairperson

Fany Lozano, Recording Secretary